



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,376	02/08/2002	Nian hua Ou	01-450	1739

7590 11/18/2004

David Mitchell Goodrich, Esq.
J.M. Huber Corporation
333 Thornall Street
Edison, NJ 08837-2220

EXAMINER

STERLING, AMY JO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3632

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,376

Applicant(s)

OU ET AL.

Examiner

Amy J. Sterling

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is the second non-final Office Action for application number 10/071,376 Laminated Wood Piece and Door Containing the Same, filed on 2/8/02. Claims 1-16 are pending.

Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed 9/9/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-16 under Edstrom, the cited Prior Art and the Buell Door Web Brochure have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 5554429 to Iwata et al.

The examiner apologized for any inconvenience to the applicant.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 3632

The specification does not include a written description of what is meant by "screw holding strength". This was taken to mean the JIS standard for holding power of the wood composite member, in a planar direction.

The specification does not include a written description of what is meant by "split strength". This was taken to mean the JIS standard for holding power in a grain direction.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the

Art Unit: 3632

claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 2 recites the broad recitation “.3 cm to 1.3 cm”, and the claim also recites “.6 cm to about 1.1 cm “ which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 6 recites a density in “lbs/ft²” and it is unclear how an area may contain a density. This claim was examined as if it were referring to cubic feet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5554429 to Iwata et al.

The patent to Iwata et al. discloses a laminated wood piece having a solid hardwood component (3, See Col. 11 line 27 for material selection) having an upper surface and lower surface that are substantially parallel and a wood composite of oriented strand board (See Col. 2, line 66), having layers (1, 2), the layers being substantially parallel to the lower surface of the hard wood and the layers which have a thickness ration of 1:1 to 1:10. The thicknesses are 0.2mm to 1mm (Col. 11, line 26) for the hard wood (3) and 5mm to 13mm (Col. 7, line 15) for the core layer (1) and 0.1mm to 0.8mm (Col. 7 line 66) for the surface layers (2), thereby producing a thickness ration of 1 to 10. Iwata et al. also teaches a wood composite boards with a density within the range of 35 lbs/ft³ and 48 lbs/ft³ (See Col. 9, line 18: 0.75 g/cm³ converts to 46.8 lbs/ft³).

Art Unit: 3632

Iwata et al. also teaches that 90% of the strands are oriented substantially parallel to the length of the laminated piece (See Col. 9 lines 64-67 and Col. 10, lines 1-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5554429 to Iwata et al.

Iwata et al. shows the basic inventive concept with the exception that it does not show the specifics of the dimensions of the thickness of the hardwood being between 0.3cm and 1.3 cm or that the width and length of the piece is 3 to 6 cm or 120 to 305 cm or that the screw holding strength is about 400 lbs. To 1200 lbs or that the device has split resistance of greater than 1000 lbs.

Iwata et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the specific dimensions and strength capabilities. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have these dimensions (See Col. 11, lines 54) or these strength ranges (See Col. 3 lines 29-47), since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges or dimensions involves only routine skill in the art. See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 3632

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5554429 to Iwata et al. as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of United States Patent Publication US 2003/0008110 A1 to Hsu.

Iwata et al. show the basic inventive concept as cited above including that the binder is between the range of 3% to 6% weight (See Col. 6, line 36). Iwata et al. also teaches that many other additives may be added to the wood composite board (See Col. 1 line 39), but does not specifically recite that it contains about 1% to about 2.5% of a wax additive.

Hsu teaches oriented strand board with a wax additive with weight from about 1% to about 2.5% of a wax additive. (See Table 1, on page 5). This additive is a design choices, used for the moisture resistant properties. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made from the teachings of the Hsu to have used an oriented strand board with the above additive in order to have the moisture resistant properties.

Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6092343 to West et al. and further in view of United States Patent No. 5554429 to Iwata et al.

West et al. shows the basic inventive concept including a door with opposed doorskins (24), a pair of stile members (18), which are oriented vertically and parallel to each other, a pair of rails (22) and a core (22), wherein the stile is in contact with the core. West et al. does not teach the specific of the core, which is taught by Iwata et al.

Art Unit: 3632

West et al. also teaches the method of providing a core(22) providing a door stile, securing the door style to the core, the hardwood component being on the outer side of the wood composite. West et al. does not show the stile having the hardwood and parallel layers of wood composite, the wood composite layers contacting the core. West et al. also does not teach the method of cutting the wood composite and the hardwood into the desired dimensions and attaching the sections together, both having the same width.

Iwata et al. teaches a laminated wood piece having a solid hardwood component (3, See Col. 11 line 27 for material selection) having an upper surface and lower surface that are substantially parallel and a wood composite of oriented strand board (See Col. 2, line 66), having layers (1, 2), the layers being substantially parallel to the lower surface of the hard wood and the layers which have a thickness ration of 1:1 to 1:10. The thicknesses are 0.2mm to 1mm (Col. 11, line 26) for the hard wood (3) and 5mm to 13mm (Col. 7, line 15) for the core layer (1) and 0.1mm to 0.8mm (Col. 7 line 66) for the surface layers (2), thereby producing a thickness ration of 1 to 10. This wood composite board used for its strength and flexure capabilities. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention from the teachings of Iwata et al. to have used a core Iwata et al. in order to have the desired strength of the door. The method of cutting the wood composite and the hardwood of the same width and attaching them together would also be an obvious way to make the device, and when assembled the method of having the wood composite touch the core

Art Unit: 3632

would also be obvious, since that configuration would include facing the more aesthetically pleasing hardwood to the eye of the user.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Amy J. Sterling at telephone number 703-308-3271. The examiner can normally be reached (M-F 8 a.m.-5:00 p.m.). If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leslie Braun can be reached at 703-308-2156. The fax machine number for the Technology center is 703-305-3597 or 703-305-3598 (formal amendments) or 703-308-3519 (informal amendments/communications). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center receptionist at 703-308-2168.



AJS
Amy J. Sterling
11/8/04



LESLIE A. BRAUN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER